Case Study - Conservation Effects

Type of Operation and Location:Cropland, Preble County, Ohio			
Resource Setting: Moderately sloping (3-6%) Corwin, Miami, and Celina soils Client Objective(s): Reduce erosion, maintain and improve yields, farm more efficiently.		Benchmark System: Conventional till corn and soybeans, no soil testing, excessive use of pesticides, no grass waterways. Planned Treatment System: Conservation Crop Rotation; No Till; Nutrient Management; Pest Management; Grassed Waterways Meets Resource Management System Criteria	
Comparison of Effects of Benchmark and Treatment Option			
Actions Before Treatment (Kinds, Amounts, Timing of the benchmark system) Corn: - Apply row starter N,P,K - Spring Broadcast K - Sidedress Liquid N - Three tillage passes prior to planting - Apply pre-emerge herbicide after planting - One rotary hoe operation - Post emerge herbicide Soybeans: - Three tillage passes prior to planting - Plant 30 rows with starter P & K - Fall broadcast K - Apply Pre-emerge herbicide after planting - 2 row cultivations - Apply Post-emerge herbicide Gullies: Disk annually Fertilizer: -Not field specific - use what always used.	Effects Before Treatment (Effects of continuing the benchmark system) Soil loss avg 9 tons/ac/yr Sediment, nutrients, pesticides moving off in surface runoff Gullies becoming more defined and deeper. Average 5+ gallons of fuel per acre Average 2 hours per acre Need hired labor for tillage Yields are difficult to maintain	Impacts After Treatment (Change from the before treatment to the applied treatment) Tons/ac/yr of soil saved Nutrient, pesticide, and sediment runoff is minimized Gully erosion is eliminated. Less equipment and equipment maintenance Easier planting and harvesting conditions Yields are increasing No hired labor needed Average .75 hours/acre Average 1 gallon of fuel per acre Nitrogen reduced by 15% P & K needs reduced by 50% Pesticide amount and cost reduced 15% Impact of the properties of th	Decisionmaker Evaluation (+) Feels Positive about the change (-) Feels a drawback about change (+) Water quality improved with less sediment, nutrients, and pesticides. (+) (+) less wear and tear on equipment (-) loss of cropland (+) saves time and money (+) less stress, less soil compaction (+) (+) Saves \$3000 per year (+) Reduced need for hire labor (+) Saved money (+) Saved money & better yield (+) Saved money & better yield (+) Saved money & good weed control (+) Save time and money (+) increased yield and better weed control; (-) purchased new no till drill

NRCS – Ohio December 2002

Case Study - Cropland - Preble County 12-02.doc- Page 1

NRCS – Ohio December 2002